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**COURSE FORMAT**

This course will be offered through online instruction and course work. All materials will be available on the course wiki: <http://esu6fieldimp.wikispaces.com/>

**Course Description**

Current research about instructional practice will be the foundation of this course. Activities will include the development of student goals based on data, targeting instructional strategies based on the Marzano Research Laboratory (MRL) Instructional Protocol, and the implementation of the targeted strategies in an authentic classroom setting.

**Required Text/Materials**

Marzano, R.J. (2007) *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction.* Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

A Teachers Reflective Guide: Marzano Research Laboratory

**Course Objective**

Participants will implement research based instructional strategies to improve student achievement.

**Doane Education Standards**

The graduate student, as a developing professional, works toward building and improving skills in the following areas:

* The developing professional recognizes and provides for individual differences and diversity.
* The developing professional uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of skills for critical thinking and problem solving.
* The developing professional uses classroom management and motivational strategies to create a positive learning environment.
* The developing professional utilizes effective planning techniques.
* The developing professional is a reflective practitioner who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
* The developing professional fosters relationships with school colleagues, families, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning.

**Requirements**

The course will require teachers to implement new instructional strategies and technology tools with their students. Participants will be required to develop a project to implement these strategies and tools designed to improve student achievement by:

* Developing goals for student achievement goals that are approved by the instructor.
* Targeting instructional strategies based on the Marzano Research Laboratory (MRL) Supervision of Instruction Protocol that are aligned student achievement goals.
* Developing a tool kit of instructional techniques and technology tools based on the model of instruction.
* Administering a pretest to determine current level of achievement.
* Implementing new instructional strategies and technology tools with students.
* Reflecting on the strategies and tool implementation.
* Assessing technology needs.
* Facilitating the creation of authentic student work via technology tools.
* Administering a post-test to determine level of student growth.
* Showcasing the project and results locally and/or regionally.

**Course Topics/Assignments Timeline**

Course assignments and activities will focus on the implementation of instructional strategies aligned to student achievement goals. Participants will be required to collect student achievement data, determine goals, implement classroom strategies, and determine post implementation results.

The topics and timeline are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assignment** |  | **Due Date** |
| Determination of student achievement goals. |  | February 1 |
| Draft of project design |  | February 15 |
| Implementation of instructional strategies |  | February 15- March 15 |
| Weekly Reflections |  | February 1 – March 23 |
| Student Post-test |  | March 23 |
| Showcase |  | April 3 |

**Evaluation**

Graduate courses are designed around 15 contact hours per 1 credit hour course. Discussion board work will be credited in the Quality of Online Discussions category of your final course grade. To facilitate effective discussion board work, it is critical for students to post their initial responses to assignments in a timely fashion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assignment/Discussion** | **Points** |
| Student Goal Setting | 20 |
| Project Design | 20 |
| Reflections | 20 |
| Showcase | 20 |
| Quality of Online Discussions | 20 |
| Total | 100 |

**Criteria**

All assignments will be graded on their originality, complexity, knowledge and contribution to the field of education. Emphasis should be on designing a recommended grading/homework policy. All assignments must be completed on, or prior to, their due date. All work should be professionally presented and written work should display high standards of spelling and grammar. Work not meeting this standard will be turned back to the student for review and revision.

**Grading Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Letter Grade** | **Point Range** |
| A | 90-100 |
| B | 80-89 |
| C | 70-79 |
| d | 60-69 |
| f | Below 60 |

**GUIDELINES FOR ONLINE DISCUSSION QUALITY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level of Quality | Comments and Responses |
| Excellent | * Integrate views * Deepen dialogue * Build on ideas of other postings * Go beyond information given * Stimulate additional thought about the topic * Feedback is constructive, specific and supportive * Well-written * Accurate, original and relevant |
| Above Average | Contains most of the above qualities and makes a significant contribution. |
| Average | Contains some of the above qualities and contributes some to the conversation. |
| Minimal | Contains a few of the above qualities and may add a social and collegial presence. |
| Unacceptable | Contains none of the above. |

The above guidelines are drawn from various sources including:

Haavind, S. (2004) Teacher as online facilitator. in Eds. Zimmerman, I. & Koufman-Fredricks, A. Mission Possible: Reaching all learners with Technology. Boston, MA: MASCD.

# Pelz, B. (2004) (My) three principles of effective online pedagogy. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks. 30(8) Retrieved on January 25, 2007 from http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/jaln/v8n3/v8n3\_pelz.asp

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (1998) Understanding by design. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.